Evidence from engaged universities around the world demonstrates that there is a global movement of universities dedicated to civic engagement and social responsibility. This movement contributes to societal change by enlarging existing notions of knowledge generation and impact. Experience and perspectives from the global south are essential to growing and strengthening this movement, and national and regional networks constitute a key dimension of the movement's infrastructure and momentum. Our regional overview synthesizes information from the regional papers and from the research and experience of the Talloires Network to describe this global movement; it also provides a collective vision and agenda for civic engagement in higher education.

INTRODUCTION

Developing alternative methods of knowledge production, mobilization and dissemination is an increasingly urgent task in a rapidly changing world. Dominant conceptualizations of higher education's role in the process of knowledge production are insufficient and, in some instances, antiquated. Although knowledge production through research is a valued function within many institutions of higher education, it can be substantially and strategically enhanced in combination with teaching and service functions. The integration of research, teaching and service through civic engagement expands both the sites and the epistemologies of knowledge, focusing attention on the production of knowledge that is relevant and crucial to solving pressing societal problems. Engaged universities are moving beyond the ivory tower, blending research, teaching and service functions with guidance and support from local community partners. Collecting, analysing and sharing university civic engagement practices from different regions of the world can foster dialogue and learning as national, regional and global networks of engaged universities craft an agenda for change.

The regional portraits of university civic engagement prepared for this volume describe a growing global movement with a high level of common vision and strategy, led by dynamic national and regional coalitions, and illustrate the distinctive experience and perspectives of the global south. In all parts of the world, these national and regional coalitions are growing in size and strength. Impressive examples include the Latin American Center for Service-Learning, the Ma'an Arab University Alliance for Civic Engagement, the South African Higher Education Community Engagement Forum, AsiaEngage, Engagement Australia, Campus Engage in Ireland, and Campus Compact in the USA. These coalitions are further evidence that there is a global movement underway. In addition, they are influential vehicles for promoting and growing the movement – through an exchange of experience and mutual support, and through collective voice and action.

This global movement is therefore characterized by both a diversity and a universality – of goals, approach and programmatic direction. While there is significant variation across and within regions, the larger story is one of a common vision, strategy and cause. These commonalities are striking, especially as their geopolitical contexts vary dramatically. The regional papers present powerful examples of individual and collective leadership for change by university professors, administrators, staff, students and their community partners.

AN EXPANDING GLOBAL MOVEMENT

Combining observations from the regional papers with our own observations from research and practice with engaged universities, we believe there is strong evidence that there is a global movement of civic engagement in higher education (Bjarson and Coldtream, 2003). The presence of a global movement is supported by the growth in the number of engaged universities, the increased

IV.1
MOVING BEYOND THE IVORY TOWER: THE EXPANDING GLOBAL MOVEMENT OF ENGAGED UNIVERSITIES

Lorlene M. Hoyt and Robert M. Hollister

collaborative action among these institutions, the rise of university conferences dedicated to the topic, the growing body of scholarship and publication in the field, and increased support for university civic engagement within communities and from funders.

The first observation to support the existence of a global movement is the steady growth in the number and type of universities that are expressing a commitment to civic engagement. Gradually, universities around the world are refining their missions, joining national and regional networks of engaged universities and signing declarations that affirm their dedication to social responsibility. For example, the membership of the Talloires Network has increased dramatically. The Network is the primary global alliance committed to strengthening the civic roles and social responsibilities of higher education. It mobilizes its members to improve community conditions and, in the process, to educate students to be leaders for change. At the network's founding conference in Talloires, France, in 2005, 29 university heads from 23 countries created and signed the Talloires Declaration on the Civic Roles and Social Responsibility of Higher Education. Today, the Talloires Network has a total of 301 members in 71 different countries around the world. With 48 in Africa, 34 in the Asia-Pacific region, 56 in Europe and Central Asia, 42 in Latin America and the Caribbean, 16 in the Middle East and North Africa, 63 in North America, and 42 in South Asia, substantial geographical diversity is a defining feature of the coalition (Talloires Network, 2013).

Additionally, the numerous regional examples in this paper illuminate the scale and steady growth in the number of university administrators, faculty, staff and students as well as community partners that participate in civic engagement activities. Such activities move higher education beyond the ivory tower and include curricular and co-curricular efforts to increase problem-solving skills through interdisciplinary collaboration, as well as to broaden the kind of knowledge that is valued inside and outside the academy. University civic engagement activities include community-based research as well as research applied to policy development and public decision-making. It may also include extensive collaboration between university faculty, staff and students and external constituencies with regard to educational goals and the conduct of research. The most powerful civic engagement programmes aim to achieve mutual benefit between institutions of higher education and the communities in which they are located.

Many diverse sectors are involved in university civic engagement programmes, including the private sector, community-based organizations, governments and philanthropists. Although there is tremendous variation in the way in which universities engage with local communities, common issues emerge from these diverse contexts, such as economic development, alleviation of poverty, physical and mental health, early childhood education and recovery from disaster.

By definition, movements are concerted group action focused on specific issues. Engaged universities not only sustain collective action within their own communities, but also engage with one another. Much like movements targeting issues regarding labour, women's rights and the environment, the university civic engagement movement aims to influence public opinion, government policies and cultural norms by questioning and working to reorient the relationship between higher education and society at large. This movement contributes to societal change by enlarging existing notions of knowledge; it calls into question whose knowledge is valued, where knowledge is managed and how knowledge can serve society.

In-person regional, national and global conferences that critiqued the dominant methods of knowledge creation and dissemination were first held several decades ago in South America and Africa and continue to expand and proliferate throughout the world. Leaders in the Asia-Pacific region are now organizing networks, major events and conferences to share ideas and advance new pedagogies and epistemologies. There are also prominent annual conferences on university engagement in North America, Europe and Australia. Modern movements often utilize the internet to mobilize ideas and people globally, and the civic engagement movement in higher education is no exception. Webinars and other virtual meetings are on the rise and are accelerating the rate of exchange among participants of the movement.

In addition to the regional, national and global networks that have formed and united for the purpose of 'leading, developing and promoting university-community engagement' (part of Engagement Australia's tagline), there are other higher education agencies and organizations for whom social responsibility and civic engagement have become more prominent (Brown and Gaventa, 2009), even in monarchies such as the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and Malaysia. In 2013, Saudi Arabia's Ministry of Higher Education held its third International Exhibition and Conference on Higher Education in Riyadh. The themes for the first two gatherings were 'research' and 'teaching', in 2011 and 2012, respectively. Suggesting, possibly, that engagement should also be a core mission for institu-

tions of higher education in Saudia Arabia and beyond, the theme of the conference was 'social responsibility.' At a recent conference, presenters from different regions of the world discussed models of civic engagement and 'the importance of engaging broad-based participation in higher education and civic society' (Ministry of Higher Education in Saudi Arabia, 2012).

Additionally, the civic engagement movement in higher education has generated significant public scholarship including books, book chapters, articles, films, reports, blog posts, websites and social media outlets. For example, there are about 20 peer-reviewed journals dedicated to university civic engagement, which regularly publish public scholarship including articles that are co-authored with community partners. These contributions to knowledge and community-building demonstrate how communities and institutions of higher education are being transformed through civic engagement. In addition, the people and organizations in this realm of activity all around the world regularly reference each other's work and describe themselves as part of a global movement.

The growth and diversity of institutional changes taking place within institutions of higher education suggest that this movement is gaining momentum. From resource allocation to faculty recruitment and evaluation, from ethics reviews to student graduation requirements, universities around the world continue to integrate aspects of civic engagement into their missions, operations and cultures (for example, faculty assessment policies at the University of Notre Dame in the Philippines, the National University of Malaysia and Portland State University; mandatory service-learning courses at the Hong Kong Polytechnic University; and the Community Based Research Ethics Review Board in Kitchener, Canada).

Movements, especially those that have achieved some level of sustained success, often incorporate and leverage resources from intersecting groups into their own activities. The civic engagement movement in higher education in recent years has witnessed a rise and spread of related movements with common strategies, visions and values. For example, social entrepreneurship and corporate social responsibility are gaining traction in many regions. These ideas and practices are often aligned with university civic engagement. In Hungary's South Transdanubia region, community activists, including the Mayor of Karasz, work collaboratively with the higher education sector to 'restore traditions and to generate income.' This community–university partnership creatively blends elements of corporate social responsibility and civic

engagement. In Europe, there are innovative forms of civic engagement such as the Science Slam and Living Laboratories and Social Innovation emerging from universities, yet the focus is largely on business engagement as policy-makers struggle to make public engagement with society a cornerstone of university missions.

This global movement also encourages and reflects increased public and private support for civic engagement in higher education. National governments, private foundations and development agencies are investing in university civic engagement (Bloom et al., 2006). For example, in the USA, the National Institutes of Health Director's Council of Public Representatives created a community engagement framework, including a peer-review process for evaluating research that engages communities. Their aim is to increase accountability and equality between researchers and the communities with whom they partner.

Furthermore, engaged university partnerships with corporate and other foundations are on the move. In July 2012, the Talloires Network launched a new $5.9 million global Youth Economic Participation Initiative funded by the MasterCard Foundation. This programme aims to address the global crisis in youth unemployment by supporting the efforts of engaged universities in developing countries to create and test innovative models that enable university students and recent alumni to become successful employees and entrepreneurs in their communities. In Russia, the national government has consolidated many existing universities and called on them to elevate their contributions to regional social and economic development. To help the higher education sector navigate this transition, the New Eurasia Foundation, a Russian non-profit organization located in Moscow, is sponsoring a multi-year series of conferences and training to encourage and guide Russian universities to develop new and expanded civic engagement programmes. And several major donor programmes, including Tempus (European Union) and the United States Agency for International Development, are providing funding for higher education partnerships for development and civic engagement.

THE POWER OF REGIONAL NETWORKS

International and regional networks that focus specifically on university civic engagement are playing a major role in supporting universities in all parts of the world. These coalitions have grown in number, size of

membership and capability in recent years, displaying impressive leadership, energy and momentum. Such coalitions are effective vehicles for the exchange of experience as well as capacity-building and collective voice in policy advocacy. International networks collaborate with regional networks and include the Global Alliance for Community-Engaged Research, the International Consortium for Higher Education, Civic Responsibility, and Democracy, the Global University Network for Innovation, the Association of Commonwealth Universities and the Talloires Network.

Regional networks such as the Ma'an Arab University Alliance for Civic Engagement and the South African Higher Education Community Engagement Forum are at different stages of development, and appear to be experiencing a similar development trajectory. They typically begin with convening informally, move to greater organizational formality and structure, focus initially on an exchange of experience and later on joint programmes, and successfully transition from founding leaders to subsequent leaders with increasing support both regionally and locally.

The Ma'an Arab University Alliance for Civic Engagement emerged in 2008, among broad acknowledgement that higher education in the Arab region was in crisis. The Gerhart Center for Philanthropy and Civic Engagement at the American University in Cairo then invited senior staff, faculty and students from Arab universities to a conference in Cairo to explore potential interest in civic engagement in higher education institutions. They discovered a high level of interest from people at universities across the region. Rather than wait for major public policy changes, participants expressed a belief that civic engagement might be a way to substantially reform higher education from within (Watson et al., 2011). Civic engagement leaders believe institutions of higher education in the Arab world need engaged forms of research and teaching as well as practical relationships with communities in this time of rapid change. The nascent Ma'an Alliance is an effective vehicle for exchanging experience and knowledge with other regional networks towards this aim (Ibrahim, 2014).

Additionally, such networks are often motivated in part by efforts towards higher education policy reform. From Mexico to Malaysia to South Africa to Australia and beyond, national governments in different parts of the world are undertaking higher education policy reform. In Malaysia, the Ministry of Higher Education launched the Strategic Enhancement Plan for University–Industry and Community Collaboration to support the New Economic Model, adopted in 2010. The latter

has as its principal goal 'to enhance the quality of life for the "rakyat" (people of the nation).' The success of this strategy will depend to a large extent on the ability of universities to create a knowledge economy and conduct innovative research and development (Watson et al., 2011). In many instances, including these two, higher education policy reform fuels the creation of regional networks as well as profound institutional change within universities.

In South Africa, the 1997 White Paper on Higher Education mandated that universities be more responsive to society's needs and called for a new relationship between higher education institutions and communities. This policy is situated within the government policy of development and reconstruction in the post-apartheid era (Hall, 2010). To jumpstart civic engagement in South African universities after the adoption of the White Paper, the Ford Foundation invested in the development of the Community–Higher Education Service Partnerships (CHESP) project, which created an initial network of seven universities and eventually became a broader forum with government and other institutions of higher education. When the CHESP ended, staff at many South African universities decided that there was a need for a forum for institutional managers for community engagement. In 2008, faculty and staff at the University of the Free State began a conversation with colleagues at other universities about the need for a network to sustain their work, which led to the launch of the South African Higher Education Community Engagement Forum (SAHECEF) in 2009. All 23 public universities are currently members.

Today, community engagement is institutionalized in many South African universities (Watson et al., 2011). Even Stellenbosch University, an Afrikaner university and the intellectual birthplace of apartheid, has made a significant turnaround by institutionalizing community engagement with its own governance structure, budget lines, academic work and student activities (Talloires Network, 2010). SAHECEF represents a substantial departure from the past, when African universities aimed to promote colonial ideology, weaken tribal authority and prevent students' exposure to progressive ideas. Numerous historical shifts explain the emergence of the engaged university in South Africa. In the early 1940s, for example, several institutions of higher education were established and implemented policies designed to transform the people from 'colonial subjects' to 'future equal partners.' In recent years, a Pan African Action Research study funded by the African Union Commission explored how the Millennium Development Goals, especially poverty

reduction, were being addressed through community–university engagement (Preece et al., 2012).

Engagement Australia, which aims to lead and facilitate the development of best practice community–university engagement in Australia, became an independent legal entity in 2005 with start-up funding from the University of Western Sydney. Known then as the Australian Universities Community Engagement Alliance, Engagement Australia's roots took hold in the 1990s and early 2000s after the Australian government decreed that all colleges of advanced education would be merged with existing institutions or become new universities; many new universities were located in rural and disadvantaged communities and adopted a mission as 'universities without walls.' In 2002 and 2003, the University of Western Sydney organized a forum on community engagement, which has evolved into Engagement Australia (Watson et al., 2011).

As we have noted, national and regional networks of engaged universities often emerge in response to changes in the higher education policy environment. According to Lorraine McIlrath at the Centre for Excellence in Learning and Teaching at the National University of Ireland Galway, the Universities Act, 1997 for Ireland provided a foundation of the expansion of civic engagement in higher education. In 2006 and in response to concerns raised by Robert Putman's seminal book, *Bowling Alone* (Putnam, 2001), the *Taoiseach* (Prime Minister of Ireland) convened a taskforce on 'active citizenship' that developed a set of recommendations about the civic life of Ireland. The taskforce produced two crucial recommendations for higher education: that students' civic activities should be recognized, and that a network of universities should be formed to encourage greater levels of civic engagement. The government then made funding available specifically for the purposes of forming and supporting a network, which was named Campus Engage (Watson et al., 2011).

In most European societies, universities are an early stage with regard to civic engagement. Because, in part, all national systems of higher education have faced pressure from the European Union to prioritize teaching and research through the Bologna and European Research Area processes, civic engagement is often part of an institution's 'third mission,' although there are some noteworthy exceptions. In the Netherlands and Sweden, for example, universities are required by law to interact with and make their knowledge available for society, but their mandates lack a corresponding funding stream. France, however, is a good example of a country where there is strong legislation

and a significant system of financial rewards; French universities are legally required 'to engage with various communities, including working adults, the unemployed, socially excluded young people and the disabled with associated funding at national and regional level' (Benneworth and Osborne, 2014).

In contrast, civic engagement is increasingly becoming central to the missions of higher educational institutions in North America. A wide array of institutional structures and national organizations and initiatives are actively broadening the definition and practice of civic engagement. Over time, the idea of civic engagement has evolved from an emphasis on service to a focus on partnership and to a means for co-creating knowledge to solve pressing problems.

As engaged universities become an integral part of the communities in which they are located, national and regional networks and their community partners are producing new knowledge that is contextual and relational, and in turn making headway on pressing local problems. For example, Auburn University's Living Democracy Project in Alabama aims to enhance the civic agency of students through immersion experiences that foster community relationships and interactions. During the summer of 2012, students lived in Hobson City, Alabama, for 10 weeks and executed a project planned with local citizens. They documented their summer on blogs and Facebook.

A decade earlier, the Universidad Veracruzana created University Social Service Brigades, a novel approach to the compulsory social service that Mexican students must complete before graduation. In 2001, the first 'university house' was built to provide a permanent infrastructure for student community work in the impoverished and indigenous communities in the state of Veracruz. Universidad Veracruzana now has eight such houses in operation. Similarly, in 1994, Brigadas Comunitarias at Tecnológico de Monterrey (ITESM Campus Querétaro) began building bridges between government, civil society and philanthropic organizations. Brigadas supports interdisciplinary teams of 6–8 students who live and work with the local community for 2–4 weeks while on summer or winter break. Together, they have improved the textile industry and started new enterprises, including a company that transforms wine and beer bottles into eyeglasses.

In Africa, Strathmore University's community outreach programme connects students with people living in the nearby Kibera slum in Nairobi, Kenya. Spearheaded by students in 2004, the programme has grown substantially and now includes 250 students, 10 faculty and more than 500 community members.

Strathmore has a 200-hour compulsory volunteer unit taken by all degree students during their 3-month holiday in the first academic year. Through 'work camps,' students and staff live and work with the community for periods of 7–21 days.

EXPERIENCE AND PERSPECTIVES OF THE GLOBAL SOUTH EXPERIENCE

The authors of these regional papers and others observe that the literature about higher education engagement is distorted and dominated by the lens of the global north (Watson et al., 2011; McIlrath et al., 2012; Tapia, 2014). The regional accounts in this volume and other writing make a significant contribution to remedying the predominance in the literature of perspectives from the global north (Bawa, 2007; Connell, 2007). The global south provides the following distinctive experiences and perspectives.

In comparison with the community work of northern universities, those in the south are driven more by the pressing needs of local communities and their countries (Bawa, 2007). While southern universities have clear goals with respect to educating their students to be leaders for change, they show a different balance between goals of community development and of student development. It is more common in the north to find a primary emphasis on student development. This contrast reflects a fundamental difference in driving forces – greater societal demand in the south, a greater institutional push in the north. A related contrast is apparent in the kinds of issue that are the focus of civic engagement in the south and the north – in the south, there is a greater concentration on work to combat poverty and to improve public health (Talloires Network, 2013).

The university approach to political activity also differs between north and south. University civic engagement efforts of northern universities are shaped by the relative political stability in which they operate, and a common goal of university civic engagement is to encourage students to be more politically active. By comparison, in many southern settings, university students are already intensely politically active, compelled to act by unacceptable and sometimes life-threatening realities. Furthermore, there are repeated examples in the global south of universities whose teaching, research and service work is steered and constrained by authoritarian regimes. In some instances, universities may be shut down because they are viewed as sources of political opposition to the ruling party; university professors and students may also risk the danger of disappearance, physical harm or death if they speak out against the regime. In a period we characterize as 'moving beyond the ivory tower', it is important to remember and to celebrate examples of when firm walls between the university and elements in its surrounding communities had positive and courageous meanings. The South African universities that were centres of resistance and political change in the apartheid era are an inspiring example.

In the global south, there are more instances where government policies substantially influence university civic engagement. These include several countries that require university students to complete a specified amount of volunteer service in order to graduate or that offer a civilian alternative to compulsory military services Examples, not all in the south, include Angola, Algeria, Austria, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Mexico, Paraguay and Switzerland. Another set of countries has organized national commissions to advance civic participation and/or formally require universities to contribute to national priorities. Witness the Irish National Task Force on Active Citizenship and the South African government policies noted above that have called on institutions of higher education to advance reconstruction and transformation in the post-apartheid era.

Also important are specific innovative models that hold promise and may represent opportunities for learning, adoption and adaptation elsewhere. Here are just a few examples:

- In 2007, the national government of Malaysia directed the country's four research universities to create new offices of Industry and Community Partnerships, each headed by a deputy vice-chancellor. This organizational approach holds promise for facilitating greater coordination and mutual support between industry partnerships and community partnerships, realms that in many institutions of higher education are quite separate and that fail to connect effectively with each other (Watson et al., 2011).
- For more than ten years, the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile has operated PuentesUC (BridgesUC), a partnership with 14 municipalities in the Santiago metropolitan area. Each year, the municipalities specify unmet community needs and PuentesUC organizes teams of professors and students to address these issues. The university teams help to fill gaps in heathcare, environmental support and community development. Innovative features of this model are its large scale, its formal mechanism for expressing community priorities and

negotiating the university response, the financial commitment by both the community and the university partners, and the high level of accountability of the university actors to their municipal colleagues.

● In a movement that has been long on rhetoric but short on hard evidence, Tecnológico de Monterrey has exerted pioneering leadership in measuring student learning outcomes. Based in Monterrey and operating across Mexico through 36 campuses, the university has for several years surveyed current students and recent graduates to assess their learning of values and skills with respect to ethics and citizenship. Tecnológico de Monterrey's research tools and growing body of experience in using its survey results are a rich resource for the rest of higher education.

Harry Boyte and others have advocated that community–university collaboration move from partnership activities to a next stage in which universities are an integral part of the communities in which they are situated (Boyte, 2004). An inspiring area of innovation in the global south has been the creation of new universities whose primary mission is to advance social and economic development in their local settings. For these institutions, civic engagement sits at the very core of their purpose; it is a purpose that pervades the entire institution and all of its functions. More than a 'third mission,' it is the overarching mission. For example, when Universidad Señor de Sipán in Peru was created in 1997, a primary motivation was to accelerate development of the impoverished Northwest region of the country.

Similarly, in 1992, the government of Ghana established the University for Development Studies to 'blend the academic world with that of the community in order to provide constructive interaction between the two for the total development of Northern Ghana, in particular, and the country as a whole' (University for Development Studies, 2011). The mission of Ashesi University College, created in Ghana in 2002, 'is to educate a new generation of ethical, entrepreneurial leaders in Africa, to cultivate within our students the critical thinking skills, the concern for others and the courage it will take to transform a continent' (Ashesi University, undated). At Ashesi, service-learning opportunities abound. Students and their professors participate in a series of substantial long-term projects that focus on people in and around the community where it is located. The College sees itself as, and acts as, a full part of the community.

Since its beginning in 1990, EARTH University in Costa Rica has focused on 'preparing young people

from Latin America, the Caribbean and other regions, including Africa and Asia, to contribute to the sustainable development of their countries and construct a prosperous and just society' (Tiemens, 2012). While many universities work to expand service-learning courses, at EARTH University service-learning is a defining strand in its institutional DNA. Multi-year sustainable development projects are an essential dimension of the university's programme – including rural community development projects in Northern Costa Rica and a carbon-neutrality initiative to reforest much of the university's 8,500-acre campus. A notable feature of both EARTH University and Ashesi University College is that they are supported by special purpose foundations located in the USA. The focus of each of these philanthropies is to build and support an institution that is deeply embedded in its local context, in contrast to investing in external efforts to assist local development activities.

Southern university civic engagement programmes demonstrate forcefully what such institutions can do with fewer resources. Just as the whole higher education sector in the north is better funded than are counterpart institutions in the south, the same is true of university civic engagement programmes. Such lessons are especially important and relevant in a period of austerity. The north can benefit from studying civic engagement approaches from the south and applying them to their own contexts.

Within several of the points discussed above, there are examples of a similar approach and experience of northern as well as southern universities. These instances are a reminder that higher education is a highly segmented sector. The civic engagement practices of different types of southern universities may have more in common with northern institutions of the same category than with those of another category in the same region. A disproportionately large number of the most prestigious universities in the world are located in the global north, so there may be a tendency to equate the practices of that elite group with those of the full spectrum of northern institutions. Just as many of the most innovative and substantial civic engagement programmes in the south can be found in less elite universities, so the same is true in the north.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS – A WORLD OF UNIVERSITIES MOVING BEYOND THE IVORY TOWER

There is an ambitious collective vision that arises from the regional accounts, but achieving this future will not

happen automatically. There will inevitably be many challenges and numerous setbacks in the years ahead. Nonetheless, this is an eminently practical vision because it is already beginning to take shape (Goddard, 2009; Watson, 2010). The impressive examples and directions of higher education civic engagement emerging around the world represent seeds that, if nourished, can yield substantial change. This is our vision of what the movement could look like in another decade.

Many universities have moved beyond the ivory tower, and many others are moving in that direction. In addition, an increasing number of new institutions entirely avoided the ivory tower syndrome because they were created with a strong commitment to civic engagement. The fully engaged university has become the preferred model, even the gold standard. This movement has been led by institutions below those in the top tier of prestige. But now many of the most elite universities have started to embrace the forms and levels of engagement that have been innovated by those with less lofty reputations.

Both the absolute number and the proportion of institutions of higher education that are engaged with their communities have grown substantially. A defining feature of the new generation of engaged universities is a network of community partners – nongovernmental organizations, government agencies and private businesses – that work closely with them in both planning and implementing community-collaborative teaching and research. These are long-term, sustained working relationships. Both universities and their community partners assess these collaborative efforts in terms of their impacts on teaching and research and also the impacts on community conditions. At the same time, a growing number of universities do not describe their community presence in the vocabulary of 'community–university partnerships', but rather in terms of being integral parts of the communities in which they are located.

There exists a much larger body of fresh knowledge that has been co-created by universities and their community partners. This knowledge has been generated through their complementary insights, skills and access – about issues such as the effectiveness of alternative approaches to local economic development, the dynamics of cultural change, the health impacts of environmental pollutants, and electoral participation and alternative governance structures.

Internal organizational changes have accompanied these advancements and have, of course, played a large role in achieving them. Many universities have created new high-level positions responsible for coordinating and supporting university civic engagement. In addition, a growing number of institutions have adjusted their faculty assessment and advancement policies to give greater weight to the quality and the impacts of professors' community-engaged teaching and research.

National and regional networks of universities that focus specifically on civic engagement have grown in number, the size of their membership and the robustness of their programmes. Constituting a key dimension of infrastructure, these coalitions are primary vehicles for the exchange of experience, capacity-building and collective voice in policy advocacy.

University civic engagement has emerged as an important aspect of the rapidly expanding online educational offerings. Areas of vigorous innovation include courses and training modules for community partners, and also for combined community and university constituencies. An exciting area of collaboration among universities is the development of online and hybrid courses that analyse the causes of societal problems that are the focus of university engagement activities. Universities have shared the costs of curriculum development in this realm, and have pooled their expertise, community expertise and other resources to create curricular units that are used by many institutions. This trend complements service-learning that is embedded in individual courses.

The impressive impacts of the UNESCO Chair for Community Based Research and Social Responsibility in Higher Education have stimulated the development of several regional analogues, professorships that are platforms for inter-university leadership.[1] People realized that the UNESCO Chair was the global equivalent of a university professorship, the kind of institution-wide position employed in many places to recognize distinguished scholars and to enable them to teach throughout the university. A number of regional bodies have created such professorships that both transcend and knit together individual universities. At the same time, several universities have established professorships in the social responsibility dimensions of varied disciplines.

University civic engagement has come to encompass basic institutional operations as well as their teaching and research. It is increasingly the case that universities meet a higher standard of institutional citizenship. They pay their employees a living wage and require that their contractors do likewise. They practise environmentally sustainable policies in the design of buildings and in energy consumption. These operational practices reinforce community-engaged teaching and research.

Reinforcing these developments is a major expansion of international exchange programmes for both professors and staff, and also for students, that have a core component of civic engagement. These exchange programmes both build the capabilities of the individual participants and also accelerate the exchange of experience. Students from universities in Argentina and Mexico, and from Indonesia and Vietnam, spend periods of time that combine study and community service at each other's institutions. They return to their home universities cross-pollinating the knowledge and inspiration they have acquired at their sister institutions. Professors and community partners who focus on community-engaged research have similar opportunities for exchange – south to south, as well as south to north, and vice versa. These exchanges emphasize mutual learning, based in an attitude of humility and respect for cultural differences and differences in ways of knowing in the host environment. Their cross-national experiences accelerate the sharing of alternative models and strengthen their own skills in knowledge creation.

The most prominent global ranking systems in higher education now fully recognize and reward university civic engagement. They first added civic engagement as a new criterion. A subsequent stage was then to integrate civic engagement in the working definitions and assessment of educational programmes and research. There is increased evidence that engaged teaching and research is an effective pathway to higher quality teaching and research.

As a result of these changes, public and private support for higher education has continued to grow. The increased visibility of positive community impacts and the production of graduates who are leaders for social change have created a powerful rationale for greater investment. Government, non-profit and business leaders have witnessed the positive impacts of university work in their own communities, and are more inclined to provide greater financial support. Portions of that increased investment are tied directly to sustaining and continuing the growth of collaborative community programmes. Private foundations and development aid agencies have embraced investment in university civic engagement as a promising strategy for addressing their grant-making priorities. Such funders are less sceptical about supporting universities; they are more confident about the strategy of leveraging university resources to combat poverty, improve public health and restore the environment.

There are, of course, powerful forces that obstruct progress towards these future elements of vision and will continue to do so. These counterpressures include:

- The trend of reduced public spending for institutions of higher education is likely to continue as governments around the world are slow to recover from the 2008 economic downturn. Reduced investment and competing claims for resources weakens countries' research capacities and knowledge base, puts additional financial pressure on families and students, and limits campus contributions to local economies through the procurement of goods and services. These conditions may result in cuts to civic engagement and other programmes, as well as a decline in student volunteerism.
- Technical rationality reigns supreme in the global higher education system and its culture. A concept of scientific knowledge is highly valued and rarely called into question, and institutions of higher education are slow to change. This narrow perspective on knowledge limits our capacity to understand reality and generate innovative solutions to perennial problems. The dominant culture of higher education values individualism and competition above equity and collective prosperity.
- Higher education is experiencing a period of 'massification' or rapid expansion of systems. The overwhelming emphasis in some countries – China being a prominent example – is on very quickly creating new universities and growing total student enrolment. In such a system, it is difficult to do anything more than construct new facilities, recruit new professors and implement traditional curricula.
- Many institutions of higher education are located in societies with ongoing political division and opposition. In these contexts, powerful forces actively oppose the priorities expressed by other groups, such as economic participation and self-sufficiency for women and ethnic minorities. The political implications of community-engaged teaching and research and its prospects in unstable or undemocratic contexts varies and presents a host of risks where university engagement with the community could be seen as a threat to the government.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The experience of engaged universities around the world suggests there are a set of strategies that can help to achieve elements of the vision and overcome the obstacles mentioned above (Watson, 2008):

- Align civic engagement with other core priorities of the university. When civic engagement programmes are seen by either their advocates or others mostly

as an end in themselves, they will inevitably be treated as competing with other institutional needs. An alternative strategy is to develop civic engagement activities that accelerate institutional progress towards priorities such as student and faculty recruitment, fundraising and educational and research productivity – to reframe civic engagement as a route to high-quality teaching and research.

- Connect institutional goals and strategies with respect to social inclusion and student/faculty recruitment, retention and success, with institutional aspirations and approaches relating to civic engagement. There is increasing evidence that effective civic engagement programmes contribute positively to advancing social inclusion and to strengthening the recruitment, retention and success of groups that are under-represented in higher education, in both staff and student roles.
- Develop and expand new sources of funding for engaged universities. Encourage public and private funders to understand that university civic engagement programmes are a promising investment opportunity, one with a high potential for accelerating achievement of the priorities of private foundations and development assistance agencies.
- Participate in, and contribute to, the higher education engagement movement. Mobilize the power of collective action. Benefit from others' experience and contribute to their efforts to transform their own institutions.
- Document and publicize broadly the emerging impacts of effective university civic engagement programmes. During the current period when the civic work of higher education is growing rapidly, a sizeable gap exists between the extent and results of these activities and the awareness and therefore support for these programmes on the part of opinion-leaders and decision-makers.

CONCLUSION

In closing, our vision is that a decisive majority of universities worldwide should collaborate actively with the communities where they are located. We see a future where institutions of higher education become more effective engines of social and economic development, systematically partnering with non-governmental organizations, government agencies and private businesses to achieve positive community impacts and academic excellence. Such partnerships will move society from a monoculture of scientific knowledge to an ecology of knowledge capable of serving society with innovative solutions to common issues such as physical and mental health, alleviation of poverty and recovery from disasters. In our vision of the future, the ivory tower is a relic of a bygone era and the gold standard in higher education is the engaged university.

NOTE

1 Based at the University of Victoria in Canada and the Society for Participatory Research in Asia, the newly established UNESCO Chair supports partnerships that enhance north–south and south–south policy development and knowledge transfer.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Ashesi University (undated) 'Ashesi's Mission and Vision'. Retrieved September 7, 2013 from http://www.ashesi.edu.gh/about/mission-and-vision.html.

Bawa, A.C. (2007) 'Rethinking the place of community-based engagement at universities'. In: McIlrath, L. and I. Mac Labhrainn (eds), *Higher Education and Civic Engagement: International Perspectives*. Hampshire and Burlington: Ashgate, pp. 55–63.

Benneworth, P. and Osborne, M. (2014) 'Knowledge, engagement and higher education in Europe'. In: GUNi (2014) *Knowledge, Engagement and Higher Education: Contributing to Social Change*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bjarnson, S. and Coldstream, P. (eds) (2003) *The Idea of*

Engagement: Universities in Society. London: Association of Commonwealth Universities.

Bloom, D., Canning, D. and Chan, K. (2006) *Higher Education and Economic Development in Africa*. Human Development Sector. Washington, DC: World Bank. Available online from www.arp.harvard.edu/AfricaHigher Education/Reports/BloomAndCanning.pdf.

Boyte, H. (2004) *Everyday Politics: Reconnecting Citizens and Public Life*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Brown, D. and Gaventa, J. (2009) *Constructing Transnational Action Research Networks: Observations and Reflections from the Case of the Citizenship DRC*. Working Paper No. 32. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.

Connell, R. (2007) *South Theory: The Global Dynamics of Knowledge in Social Science*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Goddard, J. (2009) *Reinventing the Civic University*. London: National Endowment for Science Technology and the Arts.

Hall, M. (2010) 'Community engagement in South African higher education'. *Kagiso*, 6, 1–52.

Ibrahim, B. (2014) 'Knowledge, engagement and higher education in the Arab States'. In: GUNi (2014) *Knowledge, Engagement and Higher Education: Contributing to Social Change*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

McIlrath, L., Lyons, A. and Munck, R. (2012) *Higher Education and Civic Engagement: Comparative Perspectives*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ministry of Higher Education in Saudi Arabia (2012) International Exhibition and Conference on Higher Education, Riyadh, April 17–18.

Preece, J., Idowu, B., Nampota, D. and Raditloaneng, W.N. (2012) 'Community engagement within African contexts: a comparative analysis'. In: Preece, J., Ntseane, P.G.,

Modise, O.M. and Osborne, M. (eds), *Community Engagement in African Universities: Perpective, Prospects and Challenges*. London: NIACE.

Putnam, R.R. (2001) *Bowling Alone*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Talloires Network (2010) The Talloires Network: Higher Education Responding to Social Needs, Bellagio Center, Italy, March 23–27.

Talloires Network (2013) 'Talloires Network Members'. Retrieved September 7, 2013 from http://talloiresnetwork. tufts.edu/what-is-the-talloires-network/talloires-network-members/.

Tapia, M.N. (2014) 'Knowledge, engagement and higher education in Latin America and the Caribbean'. In: GUNi (2014) *Knowledge, Engagement and Higher Education: Contributing to Social Change*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Tiemens, T. (2012) 'The MasterCard Foundation and EARTH University Partner to Create $19.5 Million Scholarship Program. MasterCard Foundation Press Release: 26 April'. Retrieved September 7, 2013 from http://www. mastercardfdn.org/newsroom/press/2620-2.

University for Development Studies (2011) 'Facts and History'. Retrieved September 7, 2013 from http://www. uds.edu.gh/history.php

Watson, D. (2008) 'The university in the modern world: ten lessons of civic and community engagement'. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 3(1), 46–57.

Watson, D. (2010) 'Universities' engagement within society'. In: Peterson, P., Aker, E. and McGaw, B. (eds), *International Encyclopedia of Education*, 4. Oxford: Elsevier.

Watson, D., Hollister, R., Stroud, S. and Babcock, E. (2011) *The Engaged University: International Perspectives on Civic Engagement*. New York: Routledge.

IV.1.1

Global networks on community–university engagement

Association of Commonwealth Universities (ACU) University Extension and Community Engagement Network

SECRETARIAT: London (UK).
INSTITUTION: The Association of Commonwealth Universities.
WEBSITE: https://www.acu.ac.uk/ (accessed 28 June 2013).
MEMBERS: n/a.

The Network provides a forum for the exchange of good practice in community engagement and outreach. The Network looks to enable a sharing of experiences in building and sustaining links between universities, policy-makers, enterprise and public stakeholders.

Campus Compact

SECRETARIAT: Boston, MA (USA).
INSTITUTION: n/a.
WEBSITE: http://www.compact.org/ (accessed 6 March 2013).
MEMBERS: Almost 1,200 college and university presidents from the US and from 6 other different countries.

Campus Compact advances the public purposes of colleges and universities by deepening their ability to improve community life and to educate students for civic and social responsibility. Campus Compact envisions colleges and universities as vital agents and architects of a diverse democracy, committed to educating students for responsible citizenship in ways that both deepen their education and improve the quality of community life. They challenge all of higher education to make civic and community engagement an institutional priority (text taken from http://www.compact.org/about/history-mission-vision/ [accessed 6 March 2013]).